1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 2 WESTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 4 BARRY GREEN, 5 Plaintiff 6 Case No.: v. 7 **COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR** 8 BLUESTEM BRANDS, INC. d/b/a **JURY TRIAL** FINGERHUT, 9 Defendant 10 11 COMPLAINT 12 13 BARRY GREEN ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & 14 SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against BLUESTEM BRANDS, INC. 15 d/b/a FINGERHUT ("Defendant"): 16 INTRODUCTION 17 18 1. Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Telephone Consumer Protection 19 Act ("TCPA"). 20 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 21 Jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331. See 22 2. 23 Mims v. Arrow Fin. Services, LLC, 132 S. Ct. 740, 747, 181 L. Ed. 2d 881 (2012). 24 3. Defendant conducts business in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 25 and as such, personal jurisdiction is established.

4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in New Castle, Pennsylvania 16601.
 - 6. Plaintiff is a "person" as that term is defined by 47 U.S.C. § 153(39).
- 7. Defendant is a lender with its principal place of business located at 6509 Flying Cloud Drive, Eden Prairie, Minnesota 55344.
- 8. Defendant is a "person" as that term is defined by 47 U.S.C. §153(39).
- 9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 10. Plaintiff has a cellular telephone number that he has had for a number of years.
 - 11. Plaintiff has only used this number as a cellular telephone number.
- 12. The phone number has been assigned to a cellular telephone service for which Plaintiff incurs a charge for incoming calls.
- 13. Beginning in or before March 2015, and continuing through April 2015, Defendant called Plaintiff on his cellular telephone on a repetitive and

23

24

25

continuous basis.

- During the relevant period, Defendant called Plaintiff on his cellular 14. telephone, on average, once a day.
- When contacting Plaintiff on his cellular telephone, Defendant used an 15. automatic telephone dialing system and automatic and/or pre-recorded messages.
- 16. Defendant's automated messages identified its company name as the caller.
 - 17. Defendant's telephone calls were not made for "emergency purposes."
- On April 17, 2015, Plaintiff spoke with Defendant and revoked any 18. consent previously given to Defendant to place telephone calls to his cellular telephone number.
- Defendant heard and acknowledged Plaintiff's revocation of consent 19. and demand to stop calling his cellular telephone number.
- Defendant claimed, however, the only way to stop future calls was 20. for Plaintiff to make payment.
- 21. Thereafter, Defendant persisted in calling Plaintiff on his cellular telephone every day.
 - 22. Most recently, Defendant called Plaintiff on April 22, 2015.

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT

- 23. Plaintiff incorporates the forgoing paragraphs as though the same were set forth at length herein.
- 24. Defendant initiated multiple automated telephone calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone using a prerecorded voice.
- 25. Defendant initiated these automated calls to Plaintiff using an automatic telephone dialing system.
 - 26. Defendant's calls to Plaintiff were not made for emergency purposes.
- 27. Defendant's calls to Plaintiff, after April 17, 2015, were not made with Plaintiff's prior express consent.
- 28. Defendant's acts as described above were done with malicious, intentional, willful, reckless, wanton and negligent disregard for Plaintiff's rights under the law and with the purpose of harassing Plaintiff.
- 29. The acts and/or omissions of Defendant were done unfairly, unlawfully, intentionally, deceptively and fraudulently and absent bona fide error, lawful right, legal defense, legal justification or legal excuse.
- 30. As a result of the above violations of the TCPA, Plaintiff has suffered the losses and damages as set forth above entitling Plaintiff to an award of statutory, actual and trebles damages.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

PR.	4	YER	FOR	REI	JEE

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, BARRY GREEN, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(A);
- b. Statutory damages of \$500.00 per violative telephone call pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3)(B);
- c. Treble damages of \$1,500 per violative telephone call pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3);
- d. Injunctive relief pursuant to 47 U.S.C. §227(b)(3);
- e. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, BARRY GREEN, demands a jury trial in this case.

1		RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
2	DATED: June 10, 2015	KIMMEL & SILVERMAN, P.C.
3	,	
4		By: /s/ Craig Thor Kimmel
5		Craig Thor Kimmel
6		Attorney ID # 57100 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.
7		30 E. Butler Pike
8		Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888
9		Fax: (877) 788-2864 Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com
10		Email: Minner@creatiaw.com
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		